arXiv:math/0702508v1 [math.AC] 17 Feb 2007

Regularity for certain classes of monomial ideals.

Mircea Cimpoeaş

Abstract

We introduce a new class of monomial ideals, called strong Borel type ideals, and we compute the Mumford-Castelnouvo regularity for principal strong Borel type ideals. Also, we describe the **d**-fixed ideals generated by powers of variables and we compute their regularity.

Keywords: p-Borel ideals, Borel type ideals, Mumford-Castelnuovo regularity.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary: 13P10, Secondary: 13E10.

Introduction.

Let K be an infinite field, and let $S = K[x_1, ..., x_n], n \geq 2$ the polynomial ring over K. Bayer and Stillman [2] note that a Borel fixed ideal I satisfies the following property $(I : x_j^{\infty}) = (I : (x_1, \dots, x_j)^{\infty})$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n$. Herzog, Popescu and Vladoiu say that a monomial ideal is of Borel type if it fulfill the previous condition. We mention that this concept appears also in [3, Definition 1.3] as the so called weakly stable ideal. In fact, Herzog, Popescu and Vladoiu notice that a monomial ideal I is of Borel type, if and only if for any monomial $u \in I$ and for any $1 \leq j < i \leq n$, there exists an integer $t > 0$ such that $x_j^t u / x_i^{\nu_i(u)} \in I$, where $\nu_i(u) > 0$ is the exponent of x_i in u. (see [7, Proposition 1.2]). This property suggest us to define the so called ideals of strong Borel type (Definition 1.1), or simply, (SBT)-ideals. In the first section, we give the explicit form of a principal (SBT)-ideal (Lemma 1.4) and we compute its regularity (Theorem 1.6).

Let $\mathbf{d} : 1 = d_0 | d_1 | \cdots | d_s$ be a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers. We say that $\mathbf{d}$ is a $\mathbf{d}$-sequence. In [4] it was proved that for any $a \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an unique sequence of positive integers $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_s$ such that: $a = \sum_{t=0}^{s} a_t d_t$ and $0 \leq a_t < \frac{d_{t+1}}{d_t}$, for any $0 \leq t < s$. The decomposition $a = \sum_{t=0}^{s} a_t d_t$ is called the $\mathbf{d}$-decomposition of a. In particular, if $d_t = p^t$ we get the p-adic decomposition of a. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ and consider the decompositions $a = \sum_{t=0}^{s} a_t d_t$ and $b = \sum_{t=0}^{s} b_t d_t$. We say that $a \leq_{\mathbf{d}} b$ if $a_t \leq b_t$ for any $0 \leq t \leq s$. We say that a monomial ideal $I \subset S$ is $\mathbf{d}$-fixed, if for any monomial $u \in I$ and for any indices $1 \leq j < i \leq n$, if $t \leq_{\mathbf{d}} \nu_i(u)$ then $u \cdot x_j^t / x_i^t \in I$ (see [4, Definition 1.4]).

In [4], it was proved a formula for the regularity of a principal $\mathbf{d}$-fixed ideal , i.e the smallest $\mathbf{d}$-fixed ideal which contains a given monomial $u \in S$. This formula generalize the Pardue's formula for the regularity of a principal p-Borel ideal, proved in [1] and [8], and later in [7]. In the section 2, we describe the $\mathbf{d}$-fixed ideals generated by powers of variables (Proposition 2.2) and we give a formula for their regularity (Corollary 2.8).

The author owes a special thanks to Assistant Professor Alin Stefan for valuable discussions on section 2 of this paper. My thanks goes also to the School of Mathematical Sciences, GC University, Lahore, Pakistan for supporting and facilitating this research.

---

[1] This paper was supported by the CEEX Program of the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research, Contract CEX05-D11-11/2005 and by the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan.

1 Monomial ideals of strong Borel type.

Let K be an infinite field, and let $S = K[x_1, ..., x_n], n \geq 2$ the polynomial ring over K.

Definition 1.1. *We say that a monomial ideal $I \subset S$ is of strong Borel type (SBT) if for any monomial $u \in I$ and for any $1 \leq j < i \leq n$, there exists an integer $0 \leq t \leq \nu_i(u)$ such that $x_j^t u / x_i^{\nu_i(u)} \in I$.*

Remark 1.2. *Obviously, an ideal of strong Borel type is also an ideal of Borel type, but the converse is not true. Take for instance $I = (x_1^3, x_2^2) \subset K[x_1, x_2]$.*

The sum of two ideals of (SBT) is still an ideal of (SBT). The same is true for an intersection or a product of two ideals of (SBT).

Definition 1.3. *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset S$ be a set of monomials. We say that I is the (SBT)-ideal generated by $\mathcal{A}$, if I is the smallest, with respect to inclusion, ideal of (SBT) containing $\mathcal{A}$. We write $I = SBT(\mathcal{A})$.*

In particular, if $\mathcal{A} = \{u\}$, where $u \in S$ is a monomial, we say that I is the principal (SBT)-ideal generated by u, and we write $I = SBT(u)$.

Lemma 1.4. *Let $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_r \leq n$ be some integers, $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ some positive integers and $u = x_{i_1}^{\alpha_1} x_{i_2}^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r} \in S$. Then, the principal (SBT)-ideal generated by u, is:*

$$I = SBT(u) = \prod_{q=1}^{r} (\mathbf{m}_q^{[\alpha_q]}), \text{ where } \mathbf{m}_q = \{x_1, \dots, x_{i_q}\} \text{ and } \mathbf{m}_q^{[\alpha_q]} = \{x_1^{\alpha_q}, \dots, x_{i_q}^{\alpha_q}\}.$$

Proof. Denote $I' = \prod_{q=1}^{r} (\mathbf{m}_q^{[\alpha_q]})$. If v is a minimal monomial generator of I', then $v = x_{j_1}^{\alpha_1} x_{j_2}^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_{j_r}^{\alpha_r}$, for some $1 \leq j_q \leq i_q$, where $1 \leq q \leq r$. Since

$$v = \frac{x_{j_r}^{\alpha_r}}{x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r}} \cdots \frac{x_{j_2}^{\alpha_2}}{x_{i_2}^{\alpha_2}} \cdot \frac{x_{j_1}^{\alpha_1}}{x_{i_1}^{\alpha_1}} u,$$

and I is of (SBT) it follows that $v \in I$ and thus $I' \subseteq I$. For the converse, simply notice that I' is itself a (SBT)-ideal. □

Remark 1.5. *For any monomial ideal $I \subset S$, we denote $m(I) = max\{m(u) : u \in G(I)\}$, where $G(I)$ is the set of the minimal generators of I and $m(u) = max\{i : x_i | u\}$. Also, if M is a graded S-module of finite length, we denote $s(M) = max\{t : M_t \neq 0\}$.*

Let $I \subset S$ be a Borel type ideal. In [7], it is defined a chains of ideals $I = I_0 \subset I_1 \subset \cdots \subset I_r = S$ as follows. We let $I_0 = I$. Suppose I_ℓ is already defined. If $I_\ell = S$ then the chain ends. Otherwise, we let $n_\ell = m(I_\ell)$ and set $I_{\ell+1} = (I_\ell : x_{n_\ell}^{\infty})$. Notice that $r \leq n$, since $n_\ell > n_{\ell+1}$ for all $0 \leq \ell < r$. The chain $I = I_0 \subset I_1 \subset \cdots \subset I_r = S$ is called the sequential chain *of I. [7, Corollary 2.5] states that*

$$(1)\ I_{\ell+1}/I_\ell \cong (J_\ell^{sat}/J_\ell)[x_{n_\ell+1}, \dots, x_n],$$

for all $0 \leq \ell < r$, where $J_\ell \subset S_\ell = K[x_1, \dots, x_{n_\ell}]$ is the ideal generated by $G(I_\ell)$. Also, [7, Corollary 2.5] gives a formula for the regularity of I, more precisely,

$$(2)\ reg(I) = max\{s(J_0^{sat}/J_0), s(J_1^{sat}/J_1), \cdots, s(J_{r-1}^{sat}/J_{r-1})\} + 1.$$

Our next goal is to give a formula for the regularity of a principal (SBT)-ideal. In order to do it, we will use the previous remark.

Let $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_r \leq n$ be some integers, $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r$ some positive integers and $u = x_{i_1}^{\alpha_1} x_{i_2}^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r} \in S$. For each $1 \leq q \leq r$, $1 \leq f \leq q$ with $\alpha_f \leq \alpha_q$ and $1 \leq j \leq i_q$, we define the numbers:

$$\chi_{qj}^{(f)} := \begin{cases} \alpha_j + \alpha_q - 1, & \mathit{if}\ j < q\ \mathit{and}\ \alpha_j \geq \alpha_f \\ \alpha_f - 1, & \mathit{otherwise} \end{cases}, \chi_q^{(f)} := \sum_{j=1}^{i_q} \chi_{qj}^{(f)}\ \mathit{and}\ \chi_q = \max_f \chi_q^{(f)}.$$

Theorem 1.6. *With the above notations, we have* $reg(SBT(u)) = \max_{q=1}^{r} \chi_q + 1$.

Proof. Firstly, we describe the sequential chain of I. Since $I_r := I = \prod_{q=1}^{r}(\mathbf{m}_q^{[\alpha_q]})$, it follows that $I_{r-1} := (I_r : x_{i_r}^{\infty}) = \prod_{q=1}^{r-1}(\mathbf{m}_q^{[\alpha_q]})$. Analogously, we get $I_q := (I_{q+1} : x_{i_{q+1}}^{\infty}) = \prod_{e=1}^{q}(\mathbf{m}_e^{[\alpha_e]})$, for all $0 \leq q < r$. Therefore, the sequential chain of I is,

$$I = I_r \subset I_{r-1} \subset \cdots \subset I_1 \subset I_0 = S.$$

Let J_q be the ideal of $S_q = K[x_1, \ldots, x_{i_q}]$ generated by $G(I_q)$, for $1 \leq q \leq r$. Denoting $s_q = s(J_q^{sat}/J_q)$, (2) from Remark 1.5 implies $reg(I) = max\{s_q :\ 1 \leq q \leq r\}$, so, in order to compute the regularity of I, we must determine the numbers s_q. We claim that $s_q = \chi_q$.

First of all, note that $J_q = I_q \cap S_q$ and $J_q^{sat} = I_{q-1} \cap S_q$. Let $1 \leq f \leq q$ with $\alpha_f \leq \alpha_q$ and $w = x_1^{\chi_{q1}^{(f)}} \cdots x_{i_q}^{\chi_{q,i_q}^{(f)}}$. Since $\chi_{qe}^{(f)} \geq \alpha_e$ for any $1 \leq e \leq q-1$ we get $x_1^{\chi_{q1}^{(f)}} \cdots x_{q-1}^{\chi_{q,q-1}^{(f)}} \in J_q^{sat} = \prod_{e=1}^{q-1}(\mathbf{m}_e^{[\alpha_e]})S_q$, therefore $w \in J_q^{sat}$. On the other hand, one can easily see that $w \notin J_q$, so w is a nonzero element in J_q^{sat}/J_q with $deg(w) = \chi_q$, thus $s_q \geq \chi_q$.

In order to prove the converse inequality, we consider a monomial $u \in J_q^{sat}$ with $deg(u) \geq \chi_q + 1$ and we show that $u \in J_q$. Assume by contradiction that $u \notin J_q$. Since $u \in J_q^{sat}$, it follows that $u = x_{j_1}^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_{j_{q-1}}^{\alpha_{q-1}} \cdot x_1^{\beta_1} \cdots x_{i_q}^{\beta_{i_q}}$, where $1 \leq j_e \leq i_e$ for $1 \leq e \leq q-1$ and $\beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_{i_q} \geq \chi_q - \sum_{e=1}^{q-1} \alpha_e$. Let $A = \{1, \ldots, i_q\} \setminus \{j_1, \ldots, j_{q-1}\}$. Since $u \notin J_q$ and $x_{j_1}^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_{j_{q-1}}^{\alpha_{q-1}} \in J_q^{sat}$ it follows $\beta_j \leq \alpha_q - 1$ for all $j \in A$.

Write $\{1, \ldots, q-1\} = \cup_{i=1}^{m} E_i$, where $E_i = \{e_{i1}, \ldots, e_{ik_i}\}$, such that $j_{e_{ik}} = j_{e_i}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq k_i$ and $E_i \cap E_{i'} = \emptyset$ whenever $i \neq i'$. With these notations,

$$u = x_{j_{e_1}}^{\alpha_{e_{11}} + \cdots + \alpha_{e_{1k_1}} + \beta_{j_{e_1}}} \cdots x_{j_{e_m}}^{\alpha_{e_{m1}} + \cdots + \alpha_{e_{mk_m}} + \beta_{j_{e_m}}} \cdot \prod_{j \in A} x_j^{\beta_j}.$$

Let $1 \leq f \leq q$ such that $\alpha_f \leq \alpha_q$, $\beta_j < \alpha_f$ for all $j \in A$ and α_f is the largest integer between all the $\alpha_{f'}$, with f' satisfying the above conditions. Suppose that there exist some $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq k \leq k_i$ such that $\alpha_{e_{ik}} < \alpha_q$. It follows that $\beta_{j_{e_i}} \leq \alpha_f - \alpha_{e_{ik}} - 1$, otherwise $u \in J_q$. One can immediately conclude that $\sum_{e=1}^{q-1} \alpha_e + \sum_{j=1}^{i_q} \beta_j \leq \chi_q^{(f)}$. □

Example 1.7. Let $u = x_2^6 x_3^7 \in S = K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. From Lemma 1.4 it follows that $I = SBT(u) = (x_1^6, x_2^6)(x_1^7, x_2^7, x_3^7)$. With the notations of 1.5 and 1.6, we have $J_1 = (x_1^6, x_2^6) \subset K[x_1, x_2]$ and $J_2 = I$. Also, $J_1^{sat} = K[x_1, x_2]$ and $J_2^{sat} = (x_1^6, x_2^6) \subset S$. Obviously, $\chi_1 = \chi_1^{(1)} = 2\cdot 5 = 10$, i.e. $s(J_1^{sat}/J_1) = s(K[x_1, x_2]/(x_1^6, x_2^6)) = 10$. We have $\chi_2^{(1)} = (6+7-1)+2\cdot 5 = 23$ and $\chi_2^{(2)} = 3 \cdot 6 = 18$, therefore $\chi_2 = 23$ and thus $reg(I) = max\{10, 23\} + 1 = 24$.

In the end of this section, we mention the following result, which generalize a result of Eisenbud-Reeves-Totaro (see [6, Proposition 12]).

Proposition 1.8. *[5, Corollary 8] If I is a Borel type ideal, then*

$$reg(I) = min\{e : \ e \geq deg(I),\ I_{\geq e} \ is\ stable\},$$

where $deg(I)$ is the maximal degree of a minimal monomial generator of I.

In particular, this holds for (SBT)-ideals, and thus we get the following corollary.

Corollary 1.9. *With the notations of Theorem* 1.5, *if $I = SBT(u)$ and $e \geq \max_{q=1}^{r} \chi_q + 1$ then $I_{\geq e}$ is stable.*

Remark 1.10. *Note also that the regularity of a (SBT)-ideal, $I \subset S$, is upper bounded by $n(deg(I) - 1) + 1$, (see [9, Theorem 2.2]). In fact, $deg(I)$ is the maximum degree of a minimal generator of I as a (SBT)-ideal!*

2 d-fixed ideals generated by powers of variables.

Firstly, let fix some notations. Let $u_1, \ldots, u_m \in S$ be some monomials. We say that I is the **d**-fixed ideal generated by $u_1, \ldots, u_m$, if I is the smallest **d**-fixed ideal , w.r.t inclusion, which contain $u_1, \ldots, u_m$, and we write $I =< u_1, \ldots, u_m >_{\mathbf{d}}$. In particular, if $m = 1$, we say that I is the principal **d**-fixed ideal generated by $u = u_1$ and we write $I =< u >_{\mathbf{d}}$.

In the case when I is a principal **d**-fixed ideal , [4, Theorem 3.1] gives a formula for the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of I. Using similar tehniques as in [4], we will compute the regularity for **d**-fixed ideals generated by powers of variables. We recall some results proved in [4] which are useful. Let α be a positive integer and let $I =< x_n^{\alpha} >_{\mathbf{d}} \subset S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. Suppose $\alpha = \sum_{t=0}^{s} \alpha_t d_t$ with $\alpha_s \neq 0$. Then:

- $I = \prod_{t=0}^{s} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_t}$, where $\mathbf{m} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ and $\mathbf{m}^{[d]} = \{x_1^d, \ldots, x_n^d\}$ [4, 1.6].
- $Soc(S/I) = (J + I)/I$ with $J = \sum_{t=0}^{s} (x_1 \cdots x_n)^{d_t - 1} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_t - 1} \prod_{j>t} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_j}$ [4, 2.1].
- $reg(I) = max\{e : \ ((J + I)/I)_e \neq 0\} = \alpha_s d_s + (n - 1)(d_s - 1)$ (see [4, 3.1]).
- If $e \geq reg(I)$ then $I_{\geq e}$ is stable (see [4, 3.6] or apply Proposition 1.8, since any d-fixed ideal is of Borel type, see [4, 1.11]).

Lemma 2.1. *If $1 \leq j \leq j' \leq n$ and $\alpha \geq \beta$ are positive integers, then $< x_j^{\alpha} > \subset < x_{j'}^{\beta} >$.*

Proof. Indeed, using [4, 1.7] it is enough to notice that $< x_j^{\alpha} > \subset < x_{j'}^{\alpha} >$, since $x_j^{\alpha} \in < x_{j'}^{\alpha} >$. $\square$

Our next goal is to give the set of the minimal generators of a **d**-fixed ideal generated by some powers of variables. Using the previous lemma, we had reduced to the next case:

Proposition 2.2. *Let $n \geq 2$ and let $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_r = n$ be some integers. Let $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \cdots < \alpha_r$ be some positive integers. Then*

$$I = < x_{i_1}^{\alpha_1}, x_{i_2}^{\alpha_2}, \ldots, x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r} >_{\mathbf{d}} = \sum_{q=1}^{r} I^{(q)}, \textit{ with } I^{(q)} = \sum_{\substack{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_q \leq_{\mathbf{d}} \alpha_q, \\ \gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_i < \alpha_i, \ for\ i < q \\ \gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_i <_d \alpha_q, \ for\ i < q \\ \gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_q = \alpha_q}} \prod_{e=1}^{q} \prod_{t=0}^{s} (\mathbf{n}_e^{[d_t]})^{\gamma_{et}},$$

where $\mathbf{n}_e = \{x_{i_{e-1}+1}, \ldots, x_{i_e}\}$, $\mathbf{n}_e^{[d_t]} = \{x_{i_{e-1}+1}^{d_t}, \ldots, x_{i_e}^{d_t}\}$, $i_0 = 0$ and $\gamma_e = \sum_{t=0}^{s} \gamma_{et} d_t$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{m}_q = \{x_1, \ldots, x_{i_q}\}$ for $1 \leq q \leq r$. Obviously, $\mathbf{n}_q = \mathbf{m}_q \setminus \mathbf{m}_{q-1}$ for $q > 1$ and $\mathbf{m}_1 = \mathbf{n}_1$. Using the simple fact that I is the sum of principal **d**-fixed ideals generated by the **d**-generators of I together with [4, Proposition 1.6] we get:

$$I = \sum_{q=1}^{r} \prod_{t=0}^{s} (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_{qt}}, \ where\ \alpha_q = \sum_{t=0}^{s} \alpha_{qt} d_t$$

Denote $S_q = K[x_1, \ldots, x_{i_q}]$ for $1 \leq q \leq r$. In order to obtain the required formula, we use induction on $r \geq 1$, the case $r = 1$ being obvious. Let $r > 1$ and assume that the assertion is true for $r - 1$, i.e

$$I' = < x_{i_1}^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, x_{i_{r-1}}^{\alpha_{r-1}} >_{\mathbf{d}} = \sum_{q=1}^{r-1} \sum_{\substack{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_q \leq_{\mathbf{d}} \alpha_q, \\ \gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_i < \alpha_i, \ for\ i < q \\ \gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_i <_d \alpha_q, \ for\ i < q \\ \gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_q = \alpha_q}} \prod_{e=1}^{q} \prod_{t=0}^{s} (\mathbf{n}_e^{[d_t]})^{\gamma_{et}} \subset S_{r-1}.$$

Obviously, $I = I'S + < x_n^{\alpha_r} >_{\mathbf{d}} = I'S + \prod_{t=0}^{s} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_{rt}}$. Also, $I'S$ and I' have the same set of minimal generators and none of the minimal generators of $I'S$ is in $I^{(r)}$. But, a minimal generator of $< x_n^{\alpha_r} >_{\mathbf{d}}$ is of the form $w = \prod_{t=0}^{s} \prod_{j=1}^{n} x_j^{\lambda_{tj} d_t}$ with $0 \leq \lambda_{tj}$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_{tj} = \alpha_{rt}$. Suppose $w \notin I'S$. In order to complete the proof, we will show that $w \in I^{(r)}$. Let $v_q = \prod_{t=0}^{s} \prod_{j=i_{q-1}+1}^{i_q} x_j^{\lambda_{tj} d_t}$ and let $w_q = \prod_{e=1}^{q} v_e$. Obvious, $w = v_1 \cdots v_r = w_r$. Since $w \notin I'$ it follows that $w_q \notin I^{(q)}$ for any $1 \leq q \leq r - 1$. But $w_q \notin I^{(q)}$ implies $(*)$ $\sum_{t=0}^{s} \sum_{j=1}^{i_q} \lambda_{tj} d_t < \alpha_q$, otherwise $w_q \in < x_{i_q}^{\alpha_q} S_q >_{\mathbf{d}} S_{r-1} \subset I'$ and thus $w \in I'$, a contradiction. We choose $\gamma_e = \sum_{t=0}^{s} \sum_{j=i_{e-1}+1}^{i_e} \lambda_{tj} d_t$ for $1 \leq e \leq r$. For $1 \leq q < r$, $(*)$ implies $\gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_q < \alpha_q$. On the other hand, it is obvious that $\gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_e \leq_d \alpha_r$ for any $1 \leq e \leq r$ and $\gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_r = \alpha_r$. Thus $w \in I^{(r)}$ as required. $\square$

Example 2.3. *Let* $\mathbf{d}: 1|2|4|12$ *and let* $I =< x_2^7, x_3^{10}, x_5^{17} >_{\mathbf{d}} \subset K[x_1, \ldots, x_5]$. *We have* $7 = 1\cdot 1 + 1\cdot 2 + 1\cdot 4$, $10 = 1\cdot 2 + 2\cdot 4$, $17 = 1\cdot 1 + 1\cdot 4 + 1\cdot 12$. *We have*

$$I^{(1)} =< x_2^7 >_{\mathbf{d}} = (x_1, x_2)(x_1^2, x_2^2)(x_1^4, x_2^4).$$

In order to compute $I^{(2)}$, *we need to find all the pairs* (γ_1, γ_2) *such that* $\gamma_1 < 7$, $\gamma_1 <_{\mathbf{d}} 10$ *and* $\gamma_2 = 10 - \gamma_1$. *We have* 4 *pairs, namely* $(0, 10)$, $(2, 8)$, $(4, 6)$ *and* $(6, 4)$, *thus*

$$I^{(2)} = (x_1^2, x_2^2)(x_1^4, x_2^4)x_3^4 + (x_1^4, x_2^4)x_3^6 + (x_1^2, x_2^2)x_3^8 + (x_3^{10}).$$

In order to compute $I^{(3)}$, *we need to find all* $(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3)$ *such that* $\gamma_1 < 7$, $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 < 10$, $\gamma_1 <_{\mathbf{d}} 17$, $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 <_{\mathbf{d}} 17$ *and* $\gamma_3 = 17 - \gamma_1 + \gamma_2$. *If* $\gamma_1 = 0$ *then, the pair* (γ_2, γ_3) *is one of the following:*$(0, 17)$,$(1, 16)$,$(4, 13)$ *or* $(5, 12)$. *If* $\gamma_1 = 1$ *then, the pair* (γ_2, γ_3) *is one of the following:*$(0, 16)$ *of* $(4, 12)$. *If* $\gamma_1 = 4$ *then, the pair* (γ_2, γ_3) *is one of the following:*$(0, 13)$ *of* $(1, 12)$. *If* $\gamma_1 = 5$ *then, the pair* (γ_2, γ_3) *is* $(0, 12)$. *Thus*

$$I^{(3)} = (x_1, x_2)(x_1^4, x_2^4)(x_4^{12}, x_5^{12}) + (x_1^4, x_2^4)x_3(x_4^{12}, x_5^{12}) + (x_1^4, x_2^4)(x_4, x_5)(x_4^{12}, x_5^{12}) +$$
$$+ (x_1, x_2)x_3^4(x_4^{12}, x_5^{12}) + (x_1, x_2)(x_4^4, x_5^4)(x_4^{12}, x_5^{12}) + x_3(x_4^4, x_5^4)(x_4^{12}, x_5^{12}) +$$
$$+ x_3^4(x_4, x_5)(x_4^{12}, x_5^{12}) + x_3^5(x_4^{12}, x_5^{12}) + (x_4, x_5)(x_4^4, x_5^4)(x_4^{12}, x_5^{12}).$$

By Proposition 2.2, we get $I = I^{(1)} + I^{(2)} + I^{(3)}$.

Remark 2.4. *For any* $1 \leq q \leq r$ *and any nonnegative integers* $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_q \leq_{\mathbf{d}} \alpha_q$ *such that* $\gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_i < \alpha_i$, $\gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_i <_{\mathbf{d}} \alpha_q$ *for* $1 \leq i < q$ *and* $\gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_q = \alpha_q$ *we denote*

$$I^{(q)}_{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_q} = \prod_{e=1}^{q} \prod_{t=0}^{s} (\mathbf{n}_e^{[d_t]})^{\gamma_{et}}. \textit{Proposition 2.2 implies}: \ I = \sum_{q=1}^{r} \sum_{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_q} I^{(q)}_{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_q}.$$

Let $\mathbf{m} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \subset S$ *be the irrelevant ideal of* S. *We have:*

$$(I :_S \mathbf{m}) = \bigcap_{j=1}^{n} (I : x_j) = \bigcap_{j=1}^{n} ((\sum_{q=1}^{r} \sum_{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_q} I^{(q)}_{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_q}) : x_j) = \bigcap_{j=1}^{n} (\sum_{q=1}^{r} \sum_{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_q} (I^{(q)}_{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_q} : x_j)).$$

On the other hand, if $x_j \in \mathbf{n}_p$ *for some* $1 \leq p \leq q$ *then*

$$J^{(q),j}_{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_q} := (I^{(q)}_{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_q} : x_j) = \prod_{e \neq p}^{q} \prod_{t=0}^{s} (\mathbf{n}_e^{[d_t]})^{\gamma_{et}} {\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{p},\hat{\mathbf{j}}}}^{[d_t]} (\mathbf{n}^{[d_t]})^{\gamma_{pt}-1} (\sum_{\gamma_{pt}>0} \prod_{j \neq t} (\mathbf{n}_e^{[d_t]})^{\gamma_{jt}}),$$

where ${\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{p},\hat{\mathbf{j}}}}^{[d_t]} = (x_{i_{p-1}+1}^{d_t}, \ldots, x_j^{d_t-1}, \ldots, x_{i_p}^{d_t})$ *and* ${\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{p},\hat{\mathbf{j}}}}^{[d_t]} (\mathbf{n}^{[d_t]})^{\gamma_{pt}-1} := S$ *if* $\gamma_{pt} = 0$. *Thus*

$$(I :_S \mathbf{m}) = \sum_{q^1=1}^{r} \sum_{\gamma_1^1, \ldots, \gamma_{q^1}^1} \cdots \sum_{q^n=1}^{r} \sum_{\gamma_1^n, \ldots, \gamma_{q^n}^n} \bigcap_{j=1}^{n} J^{(q^j),j}_{\gamma_1^j, \ldots, \gamma_{q^j}^j},$$

where for a given $q = q^j$, *we take the second* j^{th} *sum for* $\gamma_1^j, \ldots, \gamma_q^j \leq_{\mathbf{d}} \alpha_q$ *such that* $\gamma_1^j + \cdots + \gamma_i^j < \alpha_i$, $\gamma_1^j + \cdots + \gamma_i^j <_{\mathbf{d}} \alpha_q$ *for* $1 \leq i < q^j$ *and* $\gamma_1^j + \cdots + \gamma_q^j = \alpha_q$.

Proposition 2.5. *Let* $n \geq 2$ *and let* $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_r = n$ *be some integers. Let* $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \cdots < \alpha_r$ *be some positive integers. We consider the ideal* $I = \sum_{q=1}^{r} I_q$*, where* $I_q =< x_{i_q}^{\alpha_q} >_{\mathbf{d}}$*. Then, we have:* $reg(I) \leq reg(I_r)$ *(We will see later in which conditions we have equality).*

Proof. From [4, Corollary 3.6] it follows that $(I_q)_{\geq e}$ is stable, if $e \geq reg(I_q)$ so $(I_q)_{\geq e}$ is stable for $e = max\{reg(I_1), \ldots, reg(I_r)\}$. Since $I_{\geq e} = \sum_{q=1}^{r}(I_q)_{\geq e}$ and since a sum of stable ideals is still a stable ideal, it follows that $I_{\geq e}$ is stable. Therefore, from [6, Proposition 12] we get $reg(I) \leq e$. On the other hand, if we denote $s_q = max\{t | \ \alpha_{qt} > 0\}$ for any $1 \leq q \leq r$, from [4, Theorem 3.1] we get $reg(I_q) = \alpha_{qs_q}d_{s_q} + (i_q - 1)(d_{s_q} - 1)$, thus $max\{reg(I_1), \ldots, reg(I_r)\} = reg(I_r)$. In conclusion, $reg(I) \leq reg(I_r)$. □

Proposition 2.6. *With the above notations, for any* $1 \leq q \leq r$ *we have:*

$$(I_q : \mathbf{m}_q) + (I_1 + \cdots + I_q) \subset ((I_1 + \cdots + I_q) : \mathbf{m}_q) \subset ((I_1 + \cdots + I_q) : \mathbf{n}_q) = (I_q : \mathbf{n}_q) + (I_1 + \cdots + I_q).$$

Proof. Fix $1 \leq q \leq r$. The first two inclusions are obvious. In order to prove the last equality, it is enough to show that $((I_1 + \cdots + I_q) : x_j) \subset (I_q : x_j) + (I_1 + \cdots + I_q)$ for any $x_j \in \mathbf{n}_q$. Indeed, suppose $u \in ((I_1 + \cdots + I_q) : x_j)$, therefore $x_j \cdot u \in I_1 + \cdots + I_q$. If $x_j \cdot u \notin I_q$ it follows that $x_j \cdot u \in I_e$ for some $e < q$. Thus $u \in I_e$, since x_j does not divide any minimal generator of I_e. □

Let $n \geq 2$ and let $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_r = n$ be some integers. Let $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \cdots < \alpha_r$ be some positive integers. We write $\alpha_q = \sum_{t \geq 0} \alpha_{qt} d_t$. Let $s_q = max\{t | \ \alpha_{qt} > 0\}$ for any $1 \leq q \leq r$. Notice that $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \cdots \leq s_r$. Let $1 \leq q_1 < q_2 < \cdots < q_k = r$ such that:

$$s_1 = \cdots = s_{q_1} < s_{q_1+1} = \cdots = s_{q_2} < \cdots < s_{q_{k-1}+1} = \cdots = s_{q_k}.$$

For $1 \leq j \leq k$ we define some positive integers χ_j as follows. If $i_{q_j} - i_{q_j-1} \geq 2$ we put $\chi_j = (d_{s_{q_j}} - 1)(i_{q_j} - i_{q_{j-1}}) + d_{s_{q_j}}(\alpha_{q_j s_{q_j}} - 1)$. Otherwise, suppose that $q = q_j$ and there exists a positive integer $1 \leq l \leq r - q + 1$ such that $s_{q-1} < s_q < \cdots < s_{q+l-1}$ and $i_{q+l-1} = i_{q-1} + l$. Denote $i = i_q$. We define recursively the numbers χ_{i+m-1}, for $1 \leq m \leq l$, starting with $m = l$. Suppose that we already define $\chi_{i+m}, \ldots, \chi_{i+l-1}$. If $\alpha_{q+m-2, s_{q+m-2}} > \alpha_{q+m-1, s_{q+m-1}}$, we put $\chi_{q+m-1} := \sum\limits_{t=s_{q+m-2}+1}^{s_{q+m-1}} \alpha_{q+m-1,t} d_t - 1$ and we switch from m to $m-1$. Otherwise, if $\alpha_{q+m-2, s_{q+m-2}} \leq \alpha_{q+m-1, s_{q+m-1}}$ we put

$$\chi_{q+m-1} := (\alpha_{q+m-1, s_{q+m-2}} - \alpha_{q+m-2, s_{q+m-2}} + 1) \cdot d_{s_{q+m-2}} + \sum_{t=s_{q+m-2}+1}^{s_{q+m-1}} \alpha_{q+m-1,t} d_t - 1$$

and, if $m \geq 2$, we put also $\chi_{q+m-2} := \alpha_{q+m-2, s_{q+m-2}} \cdot d_{s_{q+m-2}} - 1$. We switch from m to $m-2$. We continue this procedure until $m \leq 0$.

With these notations, for the ideal $I =< x_{i_1}^{\alpha_1}, x_{i_2}^{\alpha_2}, \ldots, x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r} >_{\mathbf{d}}$, we have the following theorem:

Theorem 2.7. $max\{e:\ (Soc(S/I))_e \neq 0\} = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \chi_j$.

Proof. For each integer $1 \leq j \leq k$, we consider the following ideal:

$$J_j = \begin{cases} (x_{i_{q_j}}^{\chi_j}), & if\ i_{q_j} - i_{q_j - 1} = 1, \\ (x_{i_{q_{j-1}}+1} \cdots x_{i_{q_j}})^{d_{s_{q_j}}-1} \cdot \sum_{e=q_{j-1}+1}^{q_j} (\mathbf{n}_e^{[d_{s_{q_j}}]})^{\alpha_{es_e}-1}, & otherwise. \end{cases}$$

Let $J = J_1 \cdot J_2 \cdots J_k$. We claim the following:

(1) $J \subset (I : \mathbf{m})$, (2) $G(J) \cap G(I) = \emptyset$ and

(3) $max\{e|\ (Soc(S/I))_e \neq 0\} = max\{e|\ ((J+I)/I)_e \neq 0\}$.

Suppose that we proved (1), (2) and (3). (1) and (2) implies $max\{e|\ ((J+I)/I)_e \neq 0\} = deg(J) := max\{deg(u)|\ u \in G(J)\}$. On the other hand, it is obvious that $deg(J) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \chi_j$ and thus, by (3), we complete the proof of the theorem.

In order to prove (1), we pick $x_i \in \mathbf{n}_q$ a variable, where $q \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$. Let j is the unique integer with the property that $q \in \{q_{j-1}+1, \ldots, q_j\}$. We want to show that $x_i \cdot J \subset I$. We consider two cases. First, we assume $i_{q_j} - i_{q_{j-1}} \geq 2$. We claim that $x_i J_j \subset I_{q_{j-1}+1} + \cdots + I_{q_j}$. Indeed, for any $e \in \{q_{j-1}+1, \ldots, q_j\}$, $x_i (x_{i_{q_{j-1}}+1} \cdots x_{i_{q_j}})^{d_{s_{q_j}}-1} (\mathbf{n}_e^{[d_{s_{q_j}}]})^{\alpha_{es_e}-1} \subset I_e$, thus $x_i J_j \subset I_{q_{j-1}+1} + \cdots + I_{q_j}$, as required. (See the proof of [4, Lema 2.1] for details.)

Suppose now $i_{q_j} - i_{q_j - 1} = 1$. Let $j' \leq j$, such that if we denote $q = q_{j'}$, there exists an positive integer $j - j' + 1 \leq l$ with $s_{q-1} < s_q < \cdots < s_{q+l-1}$, $i_{q+l-1} = i_{q-1} + l$ and $i_{q_{j'+l}} > i_{q+l-1} + 1$ when $q + l - 1 < r$. We prove in fact that $x_i \cdot J_{j'} \cdots J_j \subset I_j$. Note that $i = i_{q+m-1}$, where $m = j - j' + 1$. Assume $m \geq 2$. If $\alpha_{q+m-2, s_{q+m-2}} > \alpha_{q+m-1, s_{q+m-2}}$, then

$$x_i \cdot J_{q+m-2} J_{q+m-1} = (x_{i-1}^{\cdots + \alpha_{q+m-2, d_{s_{q+m-2}}} - 1} \cdot x_i^{\sum_{t=s_{q+m-2}+1}^{s_{q+m-1}} \alpha_{q+m-1,t} d_t}) \subset I_j,$$

because $\alpha_{q+m-2, d_{s_{q+m-2}}} - 1 \geq \alpha_{q+m-1, d_{s_{q+m-2}}} + d_{s_{q+m-2}} - 1$ and therefore

$$x_i \cdot J_{q+m-2} J_{q+m-1} \subset (x_{i-1}^{d_{s_{q+m-2}}-1} \cdot x_{i-1}^{\alpha_{q+m-1, d_{s_{q+m-2}}}} \cdot x_i^{\sum_{t=s_{q+m-2}+1}^{s_{q+m-1}} \alpha_{q+m-1,t} d_t}).$$

Now, the above assertion it is obvious. If $m = 1$ the same trick works, with the only difference that the first "$=$" is replaced by "$\subseteq$".

If $m \geq 2$ and $\alpha_{q+m-2, s_{q+m-2}} \leq \alpha_{q+m-1, s_{q+m-2}}$ then $x_i \cdot J_{q+m-2} J_{q+m-1}$ is the ideal

$$(x_{i-1}^{\alpha_{q+m-2, d_{s_{q+m-2}}} d_{s_{q+m-2}} - 1} \cdot x_i^{(\alpha_{q+m-1, s_{q+m-2}} - \alpha_{q+m-2, s_{q+m-2}} + 1) d_{s_{q+m-2}} + \sum\limits_{t=s_{q+m-2}+1}^{s_{q+m-1}} \alpha_{q+m-1,t} d_t})$$

By regrouping, we see that $x_i \cdot J_{q+m-2} J_{q+m-1} = (x_{i-1}^{d_{s_{q+m-2}-1}} \cdot (x_{i-1}^{(\alpha_{q+m-2, d_{s_{q+m-2}}} - 1) d_{s_{q+m-2}}} \cdot x_i^{(\alpha_{q+m-1, s_{q+m-2}} - \alpha_{q+m-2, s_{q+m-2}} + 1) d_{s_{q+m-2}}}) \cdot x_i^{\sum\limits_{t=s_{q+m-2}+1}^{s_{q+m-1}} \alpha_{q+m-1,t} d_t}) \subset I_j$, as required. If $m = 1$ the same trick works, with the only difference that the first "$=$" is replaced by "$\subseteq$".

In order to prove (2) it is enough to show for any $1 \leq j \leq k$ that $G(J_1 \cdots J_j) \cap G(I_e) = \emptyset$ for any $e \in \{q_{j-1}+1, \ldots, q_j\}$, because all of the minimal generators of $J_1 \cdots J_j$ does not contain variables x_i with $i > i_{q_j}$. We use induction on $1 \leq j \leq k$. If $j = 1$, then $G(J_1) \cap G(I_1) = \emptyset$ from [4, Lemma 2.1]. Suppose the assertion is true for $j-1$. We must consider two cases.

First, suppose $i_{q_j} - i_{q_{j-1}} \geq 2$. It follows $J_j = (x_{i_{q_{j-1}}+1} \cdots x_{i_{q_j}})^{d_{s_{q_j}}-1} \cdot \sum_{e=q_{j-1}+1}^{q_j} (\mathbf{n}_e^{[d_{s_{q_j}}]})^{\alpha_{es_e}-1}$. Since $s_{q_{j-1}} < s_{q_j}$ it follows that $J_1 \cdots J_{j-1} \cdot J_j \subset (x_1, \ldots, x_{i_{q_{j-1}}})^{d_{s_{q_j}}-1} J_j$, and it is easy to note that none of the minimal generator of the ideal from left is included in some I_e with $q_{j-1} + 1 \leq e \leq q_j$.

Suppose now $i_{q_j} - i_{q_{j-1}} = 1$. Let $j' \leq j$, such that if we denote $q = q_{j'}$, there exists an positive integer $j - j' + 1 \leq l$ with $s_{q-1} < s_q < \cdots < s_{q+l-1}$, $i_{q+l-1} = i_{q-1} + l$ and $i_{q_{j'+l}} > i_{q+l-1} + 1$ when $q + l - 1 < r$. We prove in fact that $x_i \cdot J_{j'} \cdots J_j \subset I_j$. Note that $i = i_{q+m-1}$, where $m = j - j' + 1$. Assume $m \geq 2$. If $\alpha_{q+m-2,s_{q+m-2}} > \alpha_{q+m-1,s_{q+m-2}}$, then

$$J_1 \cdots J_j = (J_1 \cdots J_{j-2}) \cdot (x_{i-1}^{\cdots + \alpha_{q+m-2,d_{s_{q+m-2}}}-1} \cdot x_i^{\sum_{t=s_{q+m-2}+1}^{s_{q+m-1}} \alpha_{q+m-1,t} d_t - 1}) \subset$$

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_{i_{q_{j-2}}})^{d_{s_{q_{j-1}}}-1} (x_{i-1}^{\cdots + \alpha_{q+m-2,d_{s_{q+m-2}}}-1} \cdot x_i^{\sum_{t=s_{q+m-2}+1}^{s_{q+m-1}} \alpha_{q+m-1,t} d_t - 1}),$$

and it is easy to see that none of the minimal generators of the last ideals are in I_j. The subcase $\alpha_{q+m-2,s_{q+m-2}} \leq \alpha_{q+m-1,s_{q+m-2}}$ is similar. Also, the case $m = 1$.

In order to prove (3) it is enough to show the "$\leq$" inequality, since obviously $(J + I)/I \subset Soc(S/I)$. Let $u = x_1^{\beta_1} \cdots x_n^{\beta_n} \in (I : \mathbf{m})$ be a monomial such that $u \notin I$. We claim that $deg(u) \leq \sum\limits_{j=0}^{k} \chi_j$. More precisely, we claim the following:

(a) $\sum_{i=i_{q_{j-1}}+1}^{i_{q_j}} \beta_i \leq \chi_j$, for all $1 \leq j \leq r$ such that $i_{q_j} - i_{q_{j-1}} \geq 2$,
(b) For each j with the property that there exists an positive integer $1 \leq l \leq r - q + 1$ (where $q = q_j$) such that $s_{q-1} < s_q < \cdots < s_{q+l-1}$, $i_{q_j} - i_{q_{j-1}} \geq 2$ and $i_{q+l-1} = i_{q-1} + l$, we have $\sum_{i=i_{q_{j-1}}+1}^{i_{q_{j-1}+l}} \beta_i \leq \sum_{m=1}^{l} \chi_{j+m-1}$.

Obviously, (a) and (b) implies (3). In order to prove (a), assume that $\sum_{i=i_{q_{j-1}}+1}^{i_{q_j}} \beta_i > \chi_j$, therefore $\sum_{i=i_{q_{j-1}}+1}^{i_{q_j}} \beta_i \geq (d_{s_{q_j}} - 1)(i_{q_j} - i_{q_{j-1}} - 1) + \alpha_{q_j s_{q_j}} d_{s_{q_j}}$. It follows that we can write $u_j = x_i^{d_{s_{q_j}}-1} \cdot w$, with $w \in (x_{i_{q_{j-1}}+1}^{d_{s_{q_j}}}, \ldots, x_{i_{q_j}}^{d_{s_{q_j}}})^{\alpha_{q_j s_{q_j}}}$, for some $i \in \{x_{i_{q_{j-1}}+1}, \ldots, x_{i_{q_j}}\}$, and thus $u_j \in I_{q_j}$, a contradiction. Consider now the case (b) and assume that $\sum_{i=i_{q_{j-1}}+1}^{i_{q_{j-1}+l}} \beta_i > \sum_{m=1}^{l} \chi_{j+m-1}$. Using similar arguments as in the case (a), we get $u_j \in I_{q_j}$, a contradiction. □

Corollary 2.8. *With the previous notations,* $reg(I) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \chi_k + 1$.

Proof. Since I is an artinian ideal, $reg(I) = max\{e : \ Soc(S/I)_e \neq 0\} + 1$ so the required result follows immediately from the previous theorem. □

Remark 2.9. *We already seen that* $reg(I) \leq reg(I_r)$*. Now, we are able to say when we have equality, and this is only in the case when* $k = 1$*, i.e.* $s_1 = s_2 = \cdots = s_r$*. Indeed, if* $k = 1$*, by [4, 3.1],* $reg(I_r) = (d_{s_r} - 1)(n - 1) + d_{s_r}(\alpha_{rs_r} - 1) + 1 = \chi_1 + 1$*. Conversely, if* $k > 1$ *then* $\chi_1 + \cdots + \chi_k < reg(I_r)$*, because* $\chi_j < (d_{s_r} - 1)(i_{q_j} - i_{q_j - 1}) + d_{s_r}(\alpha_{rs_r} - 1)$ *for any* $j < k$*.*

Example 2.10.

1. *Let* $\mathbf{d} : 1|2|6|12$ *and* $I = < x_2^7, x_3^{10}, x_5^{17} >_{\mathbf{d}} \subset K[x_1, \ldots, x_5]$*. We have* $k = 2$*,* $\chi_1 = 15$ *and* $\chi_2 = 22$*. Therefore,* $reg(I) = 27$*. An element of maximal degree in* $Soc(S/I)$ *is* $x_1^5 x_2^5 x_3^5 x_4^{11} x_5^{11}$*.*

2. *Let* $\mathbf{d} : 1|4|12$ *and* $I = < x_1^2, x_2^7, x_3^{16} >_{\mathbf{d}} \subset K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$*. We have* $k = 3$*. Since* $2 = 2 \cdot 1$*,* $7 = 3 \cdot 1 + 1 \cdot 4$ *and* $16 = 1 \cdot 4 + 1 \cdot 12$*, we get* $\chi_1 = 1$*,* $\chi_2 = 3$ *and* $\chi_3 = 19$*. Therefore,* $reg(I) = 23$*. An element of maximal degree in* $Soc(S/I)$ *is* $x_1 x_2^3 x_3^{19}$*.*

References

[1] Annetta Aramova, Jürgen Herzog "p-Borel principal ideals", Illinois J.Math.41,no 1.(1997),103-121.

[2] D. Bayer, M. Stillman "A criterion for detecting m-regularity", Invent. Math 87 (1987) 1-11.

[3] G. Caviglia, E. Sbarra, "Characteristic-free bounds for the Castelnuovo Mumford regularity", Compos. Math. 141(2005), no.6, 1365-1373.

[4] Mircea Cimpoeaş "A generalisation of Pardue's formula", Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math. Roumanie (N.S.) 49(97), no. 4, 2006.

[5] Mircea Cimpoeaş "A stable property of Borel type ideals", to appear in Communications in Algebra.

[6] D.Eisenbud, A.Reeves, B.Totaro "Initial ideals, veronese subrings and rates of algebras", Adv.Math. 109 (1994), 168-187.

[7] Jürgen Herzog, Dorin Popescu, Marius Vladoiu "On the Ext-Modules of ideals of Borel type", Contemporary Math. 331 (2003), 171-186.

[8] Jürgen Herzog, Dorin Popescu "On the regularity of p-Borel ideals", Proceed.of AMS, Volume 129, no.9, 2563-2570.

[9] Anwar Imran, Ahmad Sarfraz "Regularity of ideals of Borel type is linearly bounded", Preprint, 2006.

Mircea Cimpoeaş, Junior Researcher
Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy
Bucharest, Romania
E-mail: mircea.cimpoeas@imar.ro